Vol. XIII. No. 10. April 1913

THE LIGHT OF TRUTH

OR

THE SIDDHANTA DIPIKA AND AGAMIC REVIEW

Hearty Greetings
for a
Happy and Prosperous
NEW YEAR
Chitrai—5015

MEYKANDAN PRESS
MADDOX ST., MADRAS, N.C.

CONTENTS:

			PAGE
1.	Irupa-Iru-paḷḷu ...	J. M. Nallasvāmi Pillai, B.A., B.L.	439
2.	Šiva Linga	Mudaliyār S. Sabāratnam. ...	451
3.	Poetry of St. Appar ...	E. N. Taṉikāchala Mudaliyār.	458
4.	The Plan of the Lexicon Committee	J. S. Chandler. ...	462
5.	The University and Indian Languages ...	J. M. Nallasvāmi Pillai, B.A., B.L.	463
6.	Yatindra-Mata-Dipika—a Review ...	Editor. ...	468
7.	Āgamic Bureau Notes ...	Editor. ...	479
8.	Śaiva Siddhānta Movement ...	Editor. ...	486

A Monthly Journal Devoted to the Study of the ĀGAMĀNTA or the ŠAIVA-SIDDHĀNTA Philosophy and Mysticism, Indo-Dravidian Culture and the Organ of the ŠAIVA SIDDHĀNTA MAHĀ SAMĀJA.

English Agents: Messrs. Luzac & Co., Opposite British Museum, London.
German Agents: Otto Harrassowitz, Leipzig.
American Agents: The Vegetarian Co., Inc., 618, Michigan, Boulevard, Chicago.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION POST PAID.

Rs. 4 (INDIAN), 5s. 6d. or $ 1·25 (FOREIGN).

(FOR BONAFIDE STUDENTS HALF RATES).

Important Notice: All orders for the Journal, payments and remittances of every kind should be sent to the Publisher, "The Light of Truth", and business communications should be addressed to the Manager, "The Light of Truth", Madras, N.C. While exchanges, contributions for insertion, and books for review are to be sent to Mr. J. N. Ramanathan, Choolai, Madras, N.C.

THE

LIGHT OF TRUTH

OR THE

Siddhānta Dipikā and Agamic Review.

A Monthly Journal devoted to the Search for Truth as revealed in the Ancient Hindu Mystic Philosophy known as the Šaiva-Siddhānta or Āgamānta

VOL. XIII. MADRAS, APRIL, 1913. No. 10.

IRUPA-IRU-PAHTU

(*Continued from page 399, of Vol. XIII, No. 9.*)

13. Though Thou art past all knowing by my sense
Thou wert pleased to grant me these organs all,
True God! The body born along with me,
As real and otherwise Thou didst me show
This is like tree cut down by the cowherd.

NOTES.

The body and senses were given to the Soul for it to work out its Karma, as the lamp-light in darkness. When Our Lord appeared as Guru in our own guise, to redeem us, by showing that we are not this body and senses and these latter are unreal as a phantasm, then this lamp light and darkness all vanished into nothingness before this Jñāna Sūrya. This unreality is on account of its transitoriness, and its vanishing is its losing its power to affect us without the entity itself being destroyed, and our author uses the expression elsewhere 'மாயாதே தன்சத்தி மாய்ந்து'.

Cf. "கணத்திடைத்தோன்றி நின்று கழியுமென்றறிந்தொருக்கால்
வணக்குறீரரனையென்றும் வானவர்வணங்கவைப்பன்."

"For an instant it appears and lasts and dies the next instant.
Knowing this, worship ye Hara with oneness of heart.
He will make you the worshipped of the Gods."

'வாழ்வாவது மாயமிது மண்ணாவது திண்ணம்'

"This life is a delusion. This (body) will be reduced to earth for sure."

'இன்றுளேன் நாளையில்லேன்
என்செய்வான் றோன்றினேனே.'

"I am here to-day and not tomorrow
Oh why was I born at all."

14\. Removed were my bonds! Lo, I reached Thy Foot.
Oh Lord so sweet who dwell'st in Heaven of Grace.
And who didst teach I was Thyself, Self-gained,
Me who thought I was different from Thee!
By the twin karma what am I to know?
If good and bad resulting from those acts
Of mind and body and speech they are deemed,
These acts die instant and aren't worth a grain.
Non-conscient is cause and effect the same,
How then do they affect me so at all?
If due to me, the actions wont follow,
And I wont act to merit Yama's wrath.
And Thy own doing, there will nothing be.
If Thou dost make me eat and store
For future use, then for Yama no use..
If You both act, one is enough for me,
No two are needed so; Thy Lordship's gone.
But Thine is Grace past measurement by speech.
What's aught will never cease, nor aught
Come out of naught; whatever is will be.
As this is true, one's stock enjoyed, there wont
Be further need; while eating, seed arise
Then will my thought alone induce Thy Grace!
There isn't need for rule that we must give alms.
How then do Karma and Karma bhanda
That distress me so bad arise at all?
Do please unfold to me Oh Siva Lord!

NOTES.

The text which we have translated as

“ Who didst teach I was Myself, self-gained
Me who thought I was different from Thee ” is
வேறின்றிருந்த வென்னையான்பெற
வேறின்மைகண்டமெய்கண்டதேவ.”

This riddle which is at the foundation of the Siddhānta, very few are able to comprehend. In verse 18, the statement is made தன்னதும் தானுமாய் என்னையின்றாக்கி, தன்னையும் என்னையுந் தந்து.”

“ His grace and Self shining alone
And my low self, fully destroyed,
And granting knowledge of me and self.

And in verse 20,

ஒன்றாய்நின்றவந்நிலையில்
ஒன்றாகாமல், இரண்டாகாமல்
ஒன்றுமிரண்டு மின்றாகாமல்
தன்னதுபெருமை தாக்காணாயினும்
என்னதுபெருமை யெல்லாமெய்தித்
தன்னையெனக்குத் தருவதையன்றியும்
என்னையுமெனக்கேதந்து.”

(See lines 8 to 12 of the translation).

St. Meykandān states the puzzle in two verses.

“ எவ்வுயிருந் தானென்னிலெய்துவாரில்லை தான்
இவ்வுருவின் வேறேலிறையல்லன் ”
நசித்தொன்றினுள்ள நசித்தலாலொன்றா
நசித்திலதே லொன்றாவதில்லை—நசித்துமல
மப்பனைந்த உப்பினுளமணைந்து சேடமாங்
கப்பின்றாமீசன்கழல்.

The state of the union of the soul in Mukti is called Oneness; but this oneness has to be distinguished from the Oneness of Ekātmavādins. While the two unite, if the individuality of the one persists there can be no real union. If one perishes altogether, the union is meaningless. If all is God, there is no one to attain mukti. If anything other than God is postulated, His supremacy will suffer. How is the difficulty

to be got over? The soul has to die, and yet to live to partake of the eternal bliss. The death here is of the soul's individuality, Karmic Ego, Ahankāra, Āṇava, his objective knowledge and consciousness, which must perish or be merged completely, and the soul's personality will subsist free and unencumbered and feel the bliss or Svānubhava or Sivānubhava.

"ஏகமாய்நின்றே யிணையடிகளொன்றுணரப்
போகமாய்த்தான் விளைந்தபொற்பினான்—ஏகமாய்
உள்ளத்தின் கண்ணானான்."

This is true Oneness, even in the language of grammarians as we have pointed out elsewhere. This is what saves our True Vedic and Āgamic Philosophy from degenerating into pure Pantheism. As Mr. Armstrong observes, we shrink from Pantheism, not from dread of losing the Physical Universe in God but from dread of losing ourselves in God, as Pantheism only becomes deadly to vigorous religion and morality when it makes man's soul, man's self, a portion of God. We can understand our author's repeated statements, என்னையின்றாக்கி, and என்னையுந்தந்து 'myself destroyed,' 'myself gained'. This gaining of our true self, this preservation of our personality is what is implied in the statement "முத்தியிலு மும்முதலுண்டு", and does not mean the preservation of *Tripudi* Jnāna or the conscious perception of seer and seen, the knowledge of Jñātha, Jñeya and Jñāna. For how is such a consciousness possible when self is destroyed, and Tatbodha is lost.

Even the monism according to Western Idealists or Psychologists is not the absolute monism as understood by Indian Idealists. What they call one is the merging together of the subject and object, and they assert this can never be separated. This is the Siddhānti's Advaita or Ananya. In an article in the *Monist* (Jan. 1913), on Fichte's conception of God, the writer sets forth some of his conceptions. The all-embracing ideal is the ideal of unity, and all human effort can be regarded as a striving for unity and that all intellectual endeavour is an effort to bring about a harmony of subject and object, that when

you seek to know anything, you try to make yourself one with it.

"Really to know the nature of something other than yourself means to bring yourself into such intimate relations with it that you may almost be said *to have become one with it.* Furthermore, Fichte says, you try to effect this harmony by subordinating yourself, as it were, to the object. If you would know an object, you must submit yourself to it, must follow its leadings, must *sink* yourself in it. In putting the matter thus, Fichte is not doing justice to that more active aspect of the knowing process in which we prescribe conditions for nature, in our experiments, and ask leading questions of her. But even here our activity is preliminary to the more submissive attitude that Fichte is describing. In experiment we arrange, indeed, the conditions under which we are to observe; but in the observing itself we must lay outside our preconceived notions of what we are to see, must become for the time *a mere seeing*, must—in a highly significant sense—*lose ourselves in the object.*

"Thus in at least two senses we may say that the search for knowledge is a search for unity. But the quest of unity is characteristic of other aspects of life besides that of intellectual endeavour. All that we ordinarily call the practical life of man, as Fichte also points out, is dominated by the effort to bring about a harmony of subject and object. In this case, however, he tells us, we achieve the harmony by compelling the object to conform to the snbject. Whenever you attempt to secure any practical results in the outside world, what you are really trying to do is to compel that which is not yourself—some external object, some force of nature, the will of another individual—to conform to your will, to become a medium for the realization of your purpose. Now, the purpose that you wish to see accomplished is, for the time being, yourself; and when you try to realize it through any external means whatsoever, you are trying to bring a not-yourself into agreement

with yourself, to effect the harmony of subject and object by making the object conform itself to the subject.

"Yet again, when we look at the esthetic side of life, we see the same striving to realize the ideal of unity. And this is true both of the creation and of the appreciation of works of art. The artist seeks to mould his objective material—words, tone, color, whatever it may be—into the form which shall express his purpose, seeks, that is, to make the object conform to the subject. On the other hand, the ideal of the appreciation of art, as distinguished from its creation, is the losing of the subject in the object. The sense of *me* and *not-me* disappears; the soul becomes one with the beautiful objeet."

Our favourite illustration has all along been a person whose whole soul is absorbed in listening to music. (We have used the simile of the cool-bath in Sivajñānabotham p. 107). The sense of me and mine or consciousness is lost but feeling is present, and the latter will become more and more intense, as consciousness is lowered more and more. All pleasure will be lost when one begins to think that the music is good or bad, as consciousness is introduced. See also 'The paper on '*Advaita*' in my 'Studies'.

The arguments against the doctrine of karma could not be put more forcibly than in this verse.

The acts of the mind, body and speech are what result in Pāpam and Punyam, and though they may appear to be evanescent, they induce other acts and results, and desire and Vāsana are strengthened and these bind us more and more (Karma bhanda), though these acts may be said to be non-intelligent; and the Karmic Law is under the guidance and control of the supreme Law of Siva. Of course, man always attempts to choose and chooses the good in preference to the bad, and would avoid the unpleasant and evil if possible, but unfortunately his judgment clouded by Āṇava is always wrong. So, man is enjoined not to eat the fruit himself but obey God's Law and dedicate all his acts and thoughts to

God, when this karma and karma-bhanda cease altogether, and Karma Sāmya (இருவினையொப்பு) is attained.

15. Oh King with lotus hands which hold the deer,
Who dwellest in High-Walled Vennai Nallur
Will past karma attach themselves to me
Or I go out to unite with karma?
And Thou doth not join me and karma both?
What need is there for Thy Pure Grace, Oh Lord.

NOTES.

As St. Meykandān points out, man and his karma act and react, attracted to each other as a piece of iron is by a magnet. But both would be life-less but for the Supreme Power of God acting on them both.

16. I speak no sense being confused in mind,
The duty of the great is to remain
Unruffled in explaining one's sore doubts.
If it is myself that unites with Thy Self
Thy Nature rare transcends man's speech and thought.
The body with seven Dhatus and nine holes
Inside which pouring me and keeping bound
Without escape, and freeing me of it,
Induc'st Thou my Will and Jnān and act
This Thy skill is a wonder great indeed.
The good and bad that follow as result
Of my own thoughts and words and acts, knows't Thou;
And yet without transgression of law's bounds
Without excess or shortness and fitting
The place and time, Thou makest me eat
Impartially, and hence Just art Thou named.
The acts of the wise men are not confused
The acts of the unwise are sure confused.
The Karmic acts which fill through all *Adhwas*
And do flow over, Thou didst remove and cleanse.
What was it then that was removed when I
In evil and good balanced did become?

The acts done here whom then do they affect?
If me, they can have no true power over sure.
If not, is not protecting virtue greatness Thine?
Oh apple of my eye, my soul's true soul!
The King of Vennai, Meykandadeva!
Do favour me that Grace whereby, in this
Distressful frame, karma I might endure.

NOTES.

The soul is ever in union with God, though it cannot comprehend Him in his bound condition, he becomes one with God as a salt crystal in a tumbler of water.

The seven Dhātus are nerves, bones, brain, muscle, skin, blood and semen; the nine holes are the two ears, two eyes and two nostrils with the organs of excretion and mouth.

The *adhvas* meaning literally paths comprise mantra, Varna, Pada, Bhuvana, Tattva and Kalā, which are higher evolutes of subtle matter, through which the soul has to ascend, after eating the fruits of karma, through all these ascents.

By means of the Dikshas, the Guru purifies these adhvas by adhva and kalā *Chodana* and cleanses the soul. And the pupil asks if *Maḷa Vimochana* is effected by the Guru, what is the necessity for attaining karma-sāmya. The answer is that though he attains karmasāmya, the cleansing cannot be perfected without the guru's touch. The further question is asked as to what remains to be eaten even after the Guru's touch. It is Prārabdha that remains till the body lasts. But to the Jivan mukta who has dedicated all his acts &c., to God, this Bhoga becomes God's Bhoga itself. Compare the verse in *Unmeinerivilakkam.* "பாதகங்கள் செய்திடினும், &c." The pupil would insinuate that if he had yet to enjoy Prárabdha even after the Guru's touch, God's justice would be affected.

17. To make them serve, to some Thou show'st the way;
The rest are in Thy toils. Those dead to self
By Thy Eye's Flash, to them Thou givest Thy self

To others art concealed why Oh My Lord
Full crowned with Honeyed cassia of Vennai.

NOTES.

All are God's children, and yet some receive His favours and others are wallowing in death and birth. This inequality is the subject of discussion in this stanza. This is apparently so. His grace is acting on all; but each individual's karma and desert does not fit him to receive the grace of God in full. It is those matured souls that can deserve His Final grace. It is by our own self will, we shut out God, Who is ever with us and in us.

18. My birth's real reason not perceived,
The earth's great Lord I thought I was.
Untruth for truth I did mistake;
The earth's vain things I sought, not Him;
In me He was concealed yet moved
With me. And what concealed myself
And Him, the sense of I and mine,
He did perceive and follow me
In bodies, births and in worlds all,
Entering when I did and leaving when I left
And endless fruit to me did cause
According to law and without
His leaving me, He did become
My own servant and see the play
Of my births and returns and stand
One with myself my Father Lo!
Filled with o'er-flowing Love He did
In the Town of Grace appear and show
How His Great Joy can be deserved
And can destroy all world's untruth.
He bore the name Meykandanath
So that all seagirt world may know
And soared over me in Him Concealed.
His Grace and Self shining alone
And my low self fully destroyed

And granting knowledge of me and self
His actionlessness and my own
Want of all Power, He showed, my Lord
What Wonder This in me does raise!

NOTES.

This shows how God is ever with us, in sakala and suddha, ever working for our good as suits our condition. He follows us so close everywhere and anticipates and answers our wants and wishes that the author calls him a servant.

And St. Sundara called God his friend who was with him even in his mischiefs. And yet how God soars high above all, transcendent, covering us fully in Him, merging us in His Glory and Bliss. The destruction fully of man's low individuality, though his personality is fully safeguarded has to be particularly noted. This the author points out in several places. There is complete subordination even in mukti; and the soul is alone capable of enjoying the unspeakable Bliss and is not entitled to any other powers of the Lord. God is actionless, as there is nothing objective to him and He has no attachment; and man can neither know nor act unless actuated by a higher power, as a consonant by a vowel. It is when the soul recognizes fully his powerlessness and submits his will to God and surrenders, his egoity will be destroyed.

19. Me who am sinking in *Dharm* and *Adharm*
The Lord whose throat did swallow poison dark
From the black sea, Svetavana of Vennai
In my own Form He came and saved with Grace.

NOTES.

The self that is surrendered by the soul, The Tat Bhoda or Ahankara or Āṇava is the best offering of food (Naivethyam) ('தற்போதக் கவள மிடக்களித்துண்டு') to God, and this is the food which inducing both Papam (Adharma) and Punyam (Dharma) acts as a poison. This poison therefore when we transfer it to the Golden orb of the Sun (as in the Rig Veda Hymn), Hiraṇmaya Siva-surya, Bhargas, this showers ambrosia on us (விடமேஅமிர்தம் பிலிற்றும்மே), while this poison has no effect on

God Himself as He is 'வேண்டுதல் வேண்டாமையிலான்' (having no likes nor dislikes).

20. Who is the One with them who did give up
Relations, parents, wife, and everything else
Who is far from them who are not like them,
Who has no end nor any beginning,
He did appear and my evil mind control
Fixed firm, and held, my darkness and light lost;
Without His entering me nor my leaving Pās
By entering Him. In that state of being One,
Which is not one, not dual nor neither,
When though He did not give His greatness all,
I did gain all the greatness which I could;
And He gave me not himself but me too,
And end-less joy out of His sea of Bliss;
And filled me in and out ever inseparate
And showed me such rare magnanimity
And granted me the lotus of His Foot
He is The Lord who is my King and Chief
Of Vennai girt by Pennar of great Floods,
And Meykandadeva, Protector sure,
Whose Temple is His Grace. He is the One
Eye of all souls in this world that destroyed
All my mala, when I Him did approach.

NOTES.

It is only when we renounce all, family, wife, friends and glittering things of this vain world, which are, as if it were mere delusion so transitory and so elusive, that God gives Himself wholly to us; and St. Manickavachaka asks who is the better for the bargain.

"தந்ததுன் தன்னை கொண்டதென் றன்னை
சங்கரா வார்கொலோசதுரர்."

"Thou gavest Thyself to me, and took me unto Thyself,
Oh Sankara, who is the cleverer of the two".

As we are always in God, there is no question of His coming to us or our going to Him. The advaita which is

described as the state of Oneness, as the oneness of vowel and consonants, is further defined by his famous Phrase "ஒன்றாகாமல், இரண்டாகாமல் ஒன்றும்இரண்டுமின்றாகாமல்", neither one, nor two nor neither.

The released soul is alone entitled to eternal Bliss and not to God's Powers of creation &c, as we have already pointed out. This is clearly enunciated in the concluding Sutras of Bādarayana. (உயிர்தானும் சிவானுபவமொன்றினுக்கேயுரித்தே" (Siddhiyar) 'அருளாலயத்தன்.' His Grace or Sakti is the Temple wherein He dwells. This is the Parama Vyoma, Parama Akās, Chitākas, Paramālaya of the upanishats, identical with the Supreme Jñāna Sakti who is said to be Siva's Sarira also. He dwells in Her, and She dwells in Him ; and the soul dwells in them Both, and Both dwell in the soul. This is the mystery of mysteries.

"உடையாளுன்றன் நடுவிருக்கும்
உடையாள் நடுவுள் நீயிருத்தி
அடியேன் நடுவுளிருவீரும்
இருப்பது."

The mistress dwells in midmost of Thyself
Within the mistress centred dwellest Thou
Midst of Thy servant if Ye Both do dwell.—(*Dr. Pope.*)

The Tamil commentary is by one Namasivaya Thambiran of Tiruvāvaduturai Mutt and it is a most illuminating one.

THE END.

Hail to our Saint Arunaṇdi Siva.

J. M. N.

மகாமகோபாத்தியாய
டாக்டர். உ. வே. சாமிநாதையர்
நூல் நிலையம்,
சென்னை-600090.

SIVA LINGA.*

Śiva Liṅga is a sacred object of worship among the 200 millions of Hindus who occupy the vast continent of India and the spicy isle of Ceylon. They represent a seventh part of the population of the whole world and they enjoy an unrivalled reputation for their ancient civilization. Their religion is admittedly the oldest of the existing religions: and it is an undeniable fact that it has created an exceptionally high degree of spiritual fervour in the hearts of its adherents. The effect of the religion on its adherents could be easily gauged from the standard of morality maintained by them, and I am sure that a crime statistics of the different countries of the world would show the "Mild Hindu" to great advantage. The object of worship of such a people should not be attacked at random, and the feelings of the 200 millions offended for no mistake committed by them. I do not think that the propagation of any religion involves the necessity of offending the feelings of believers in other religions; but on the contrary, it is, I thing, the duty of every believer in God that he does not in any way hurt the feelings of others who likewise believe in God, but in a different form. I am very sorry to find that this important duty of man is lost sight of by some of our Christian friends who would not scruple to call Śiva Liṅga, our sacred object of worship, a Phallic emblem. If this is what is known as Christian principle, I will speak no more of it. Let it speak for itself.

But I am glad that this uncalled for and unpardonable attack on the part of a Christian writer has given the Hindus an opportunity to explain the true significance of Śiva Liṅga, and I therefore consider it my duty, as a Hindu, to lay before the public the little that I know of the subject.

* A lecture delivered by S. Sabaratna Mudaliyar at the Jaffna Hindu College Hall on the 21st February 1913.

Before entering into an explanation of Śiva Liṅga, I have to say a few words on the meaning of the word Liṅga. Liṅga is derived from the Sanskrit root *Lika* which means to sculpture or to paint, and Liṅga means one that sculptures or paints. God being the Sculptor of the Universe, He is known as Liṅga, and this word has become ultimately to mean any form or symbol that represents Him. It has become in a later stage to mean any sign or symbol, in a general sense, and it is in this sense the word is used now. Refer to any Dictionary—Sanscrit or Tamil—and you will find the meaning of the word as a *symbol* or a *mark*—a சின்னம், a குறி. The words is used in this sense by Lexicographers, Grammarians and Logicians; and it may even be found as a technical term used in this sense in Hindu Logic. *Lingapattiam* is the name of a commentary on the meanings of Sanskrit words, and one could clearly see in what sense the word is used as the title of that Book. But of course, in course of time, the word happened to convey other meanings as well, and among them that of the generative organ, by the common law of degeneration of words which is not peculiar to Tamil or Sanskrit alone. Even then, this degenerated import of the word is not its chief meaning, but it is only a secondary one of very rare use. How the word happened to be used in this sense could itself be easily traced. There is an Etymological rule in Tamil in known as இடக்கரடக்கல் which is a form of decorum used in giving expression to objects which would not admit of open mention. The genital organ came to be referred to according to this rule as இலிங்கம் or குறி, and the use of these words in this sense has become a fashion in course of time. Not only the word *Lingam* but the word *Kuri* itself is used in this sense; but no one who has any idea of Tamil will contend that every *Kuri* is a genital organ. The word *Kuri* means a punctuation, a brandmark &c., &c., and I am sure that no punctuation, will ever be said to represent a genital organ.

Another derivation, of the word *Liṅgam* is *Liṅg*, which means involution, and *Gam*, which means evolution. So that

Liṅgam is the priciple of involution and evolution combined together, and such a combiration can only be traced to God, the primordial cause of the whole *Jagat*.

It could thus be clearly seen that the radical meaning of the word *Liṅgam* does not in the least convey any sense applicable to the generative organ, but, on the contrary, the real meaning of the word may be found so sublime and so deep that it will immensely benefit one to scrutinise the word and learn its meaning analytically.

So far for the word Liṅgam. I will now proceed to explain, as briefly as I can, the meaning of Śiva Liṅgam; but I must say at the outset that this object has a large stock of mysticism about it which can only be explained by an adept for whose qualifications I have the least pretence. Śiva Liṅgam is explained at great length by Śiva Āgamas and several Purāṇas; and the Vedas themselves could be found to have their own explanation of Śiva Liṅgam.

It is the main principle of Hindu Philosophy—and I am sure that principle is admitted by all religions—that every particle of this great Jagat is moved by God. There cannot be any movement without God, and the existence of the universe would be altogether impossible without Divine energy. The principle of creation has been very minutely and systematically described in our Sāstras according to which Śiva Liṅga is the embodiment of the cosmic creation. There was the *Nirguṇa Brahm*; and there was the primordial cosmic element called Māyā. What was the course taken by the Divine Energy in producing the cosmic world out of Māyā? Maya is an extremely subtle matter without any form or shape, and it is of two kinds—*Sāddha Māyā* and *Asudda Māyā*—or the lower and upper *Maya*. This Maya is in the presence of Śivam or *Nirguṇa Brahm* and that of its *Sakti* or Divine Energy. This *Sakti* having energised Suddha Māyā, the Mundane egg of the universe was formed. This was *Nādha* or the principle of sound. This was what is known as *Nāma* or name—the first expression of limitation. From this *Nāda*

or *Nāma* came out *Bhindu* or *Rupa* i. e. the form—the second stage of limitation. This name and form—*Nāma* and *Rūpa*—is what is known as *Omkāra Praṇava*; and this is the seed and seat of all matter and force. The *Nāda* is represented by a line and the Bhindu by a disc. It is this *Nāda* or vibration that is known as *Liṅga*, and *Bindu* is what is known as its *Pita*. This *Liṅgam* with its *Pītam* or the principle of Name and Form is still beyond comprehension, and the form that could be comprehended a litter better came out of the *Bindhu* above referred to in the order of evolution. This is what is known as *Sādākkiam* or *Sadāsivam*. This is *Rūpā-Rūpam* or with shape and without shape. From this *Sadhāsiva* came out Mahesvara, with fully developed form, from him *Rudra*, in the reign of *Asudda Maya*, from him *Vishnu*, and from him, *Brahma*. These nine different phases or *Navapetam* are the different stages of evolution which the great God—or properly speaking—His *Sakti*—assumed in manifesting Itself to the souls—or in fact to excite their intelligence, and evolve this Jagat or universe out of *Maya*. The different actions in the region of Suddha Maya are performed by *Sadhāsiva* and *Maheswara*, while those in the lower *Asuddha Maya* by *Rudra*, *Vishnu* and *Brahma*—the Hindu Traid. It could thus be seen what poistion the *Nada* and *Bhindu* hold in the order of cosmic evolution. These two principles as I have already said, are known as *Pranava*—Nada representing *Nama*, and Bindu representing *Rupa*—and it is this *Praṇava* that is represented by *Siva Lingam*. *Natham* or the principle of vibration, or the first stage of cosmic energy—the mundane egg—is represented by a line and *Bindu*, the next stage, by a disc. The line is the *Linga* and the disc is the *Pita*. We know that the principle of all writings in any language is embodied in this line and disc. Can we with any sense of correct knowledge call this *Linga* an emblem of generative organ? I am sorry that our critics are unable to form an idea of the creative principle except through the genital organ! You will see that in the order of evolution above out-lined, no fully developed form is

manifested untill the stage of *Mahesvara* is reached. Is it possible then to call Nāda and Bhiṇdu which are far above the developed form of Mahesvara as one of his organs?

Šiva Liṅga again is said to be of three kinds—*Vyaktam Avyaktam* and *Vyaktavyaktam* or *Sakaḷam*, *Nishkaḷam*, and *Sakaḷanishkaḷam*. The pure form of *Sat*, *Chit* and *Ānandam* of Sivam is known as *Avyaktam* or *Nishkaḷa Liṅgam*. The form to which name and form are particularly traceable is called *Vyaktāvyaktam* or *Sakaḷanishkaḷa Liṅgam*. It is this that is generally known as *Sādakkiam* or *Šiva Lingam*. The form in which name and form are fully developed is called *Vyaktam* or *Sakala Liṅgam*. Under this class of *Vyakta-lingams* fall the 25 forms of *Mahesvara*, such as *Chandrsegara*, *Uma Mahesa* &c., &c. These forms are fully developed and are said to embody the varions limbs of a perfect form, such as head, face, hands, legs &c. It is the embodiment of all these limbs that is called Mahesvara Liṅga, and can we then say that the figure embodying all these limbs represents only one of such limbs—the phallus? and can we call the Avyakta and Vyaktāvyakta Lingas which have no body or shape whatever, a phallus—a fully developed form?

This *Sādakkiam* or *Siva Liṅgam* is again explained in the Āgamas in five other forms; namely *Siva Sdāakkiam*, *Amurti Sādakkiam*, *Mūrti Sādakkiam*, *Kartiru Sādakkiam* and *Karma Šādakkiam*. Of these five, the *Mūrti Sathakkia*-Linga and *Kartiru-Sādakkia-liṅga* exhibit in their forms fully developed faces, and they are called *Muka-Linga-Murti* or Liṅga with face. May I ask our critics whether a phallus has a face?

The Šiva Linga that is generally seen in many of our temples is the form of *Karmasādakkiam* which embodies in it the *Jñana-lingam* of Nādam and the *Pita Liṅgam* of Bhindu. This is what is known as Sādakkiam or the form of God in His capacity as the Agent of the five actions of *Srishti*, *Stiti*, *Sankhāram*, *Thirobhavam* and *Anugraham*. In other words, Siva in His capacity as the Agent of *Pañchakrityam* is known as *Liṅga*, meaning thereby the Sculptor of the universe, as already explained, and as the primordial germ of the cosmic appearance. The Agamas explain at length that this *Liṅga* embodies in it the various differentiations of the *Jagat* known

as He, She and It; and in fact they allot different portions of this Linga for the different differentiations. This form, again, emdodies in it the Hindu Triad of *Brahma*, *Vishṇu*, and *Rudra* as well as the *Vyashti* forms of *Praṇava* which is the germ of the 96 elementary principles of the Jagat known as *Tatvas*. We may be able to learn a good deal of the cosmic principles, and of their modes and methods of involution and evolution if we study under a competent preceptor the true meaning of Śiva Liṅga. I would refer you to a series of very valuable and interesting articles contributed to the Madras *Siddhānta Dīpika* in 1906 and 1907 by Mr. Rangaswamy Aiyar under the heading "The inner meaning of Śiva Liṅgam". The sublime meaning of Śiva Linga may be found expounded in *Tirumantram*, *Linga Purāṇam*, *Siva Purāṇam*, *Vāyusamhita*, *Sūtasamhita* and several other Tamil works of great reputation, and the Āgamas devote volumes to the excellence of Siva Linga. If one could have a glimpse of the meanings, of the several rites and ceremonies performed at a *Linga-Stāpana*, he would be able to have a correct meaning of the sacred Śiva Lingam.

The Āgamas again speak of seven kinds of *Linga*, viz:—*Gopuram*, *Sikaram*, *Dvāram*, *Prakāram*, *Balipītam*, *Archalingam* and *Mulalingam*. The Tower, the dome, the gateway, the court yard round the temple, are all called Lingas as they represent *Siva-Sakti* one way or the other, and are therefore entitled to our veneration and worship. Are these all to be called phallic symbols, I ask? It is again one of the important doctrines of the Hindu religion that we have to perform our worship on *Guru*, *Jangamam*, and *Lingam*. The Lingam herein referred to is a term which includes the various images of Siva which we worship in our temples. Can we say that all these images are phallic symbols? Surely it does not require much research into the Hindu Śāṣtras to have a general idea of the meaning of Śiva Lingam, and it is not possible to conceive how the critics came to make this unfounded and blasphemous allegation against our sacred object of worship which is replete with sound and solemn significance. It may be that a phallic emblem was considered sacred by ancient Romans or Greeks. But Hindus are neither

Romans nor Greeks; and it is quite unreasonable and uncharitable to charge the Hindus with an idea to which they were in no way responsible. Evidently the ancient Romans or Greeks borrowed the Linga worship from the Hindus, and in their debased ignorance put a wrong construction on it, having misunderstood the language used by the Hindus in describing it. Are the Hindus to be taken to task on account of an idiotic mistake committed by foreign nations?

If we refer to the Purānas, we will find Śiva Linga being further explained. When *Brahma* and *Vishnu*, in their arrogance, fought with each other for supremacy, the Lord *Paramesvara* appeared in their midst in the form of a flame whose beginning or end they were unable to discover. This flame of immeasurable effulgence is called *Linga*. This Linga is said to represent the sacred fire of the *Vedic Yajnas*, while the temples stand for the sacrificial grounds. These temples again represent our hearts or *Hridaya*, and our Lord is said to abide in our hearts in the form of a Linga or a glow of effulgence, as the soul of our souls. Surely none of these significance of *Siva Linga* has any reference to phallic emblem, and I challenge our critics to quote a single verse in any of our Śāstras in support of their unfounded allegation.

I think I have said enough to convince you that the charge laid againt our sacred object of worship is as unfounded as it is blasphemous. If you have a desire to be more fully informed of *Siva Linga* you will do well to make a study of it under a competent *Guru*, and you will then be able to see how the incomprehensible and indescribable Śivam assumed this *Linga* form in order to make Himself known to us, and how this Linga form comprises in itself, in a very subtle manner, the most primordial germ of the whole Jagat—in short how the unlimited Śivam started a limitation to benefit the innumerable souls. I hope, and I pray that you will all be benefitted by this *Mahā Linga Siva Rūpam*.

S. S.

POETRY OF ST. APPAR.

(Continued from page 427 of No 8, Vol. XIII).

In some chapters of St. Appar's Devāram the narration of certain heroic events gets a dramatic strain. This is prominent in the chapters entitled "திருமறைக்காடு திருநேரிசை" and "ஸ்ரீகைலாயம் திருநேரிசை" of his first Tirumurai. They both treat about Rāvaṇa at Mt. Kailās. Though this theme is harped upon in the last stanzas of almost all his chapters, the manner of narration in them differs from that of the said two chapters. In the former, the stanzas are mere hymns uttered with Bhakti in St. Appar's style of concluding his songs, whereas in the latter their lyric function is practically very little, and the person who repeats them is expected to act to some extent the double part of Rāvaṇa and Śiva. No doubt to one who is acquainted with the modern stage, it will be almost impossible to find any dramatic vein in them, and one would be surprised if it should be stated that the said two chapters should be considered as highly evolved dramatic specimens for St. Appar's age. For, it should be remembered that the Tamil drama during the time of St. Appar was no stage representation, and the stage *pār excellence* was then only a portion of a public street well sweeped for the purpose and lighted with torches. The action was confined to the exhibition of the exploits of any hero of the religious history or mythology. The actors who were generally very few in number had also to perform the function of the chorus. The sleepy spectators appreciated the action in proportion to the bombast and the noise of the actors. We do not possess any accidental parallel for the purpose of illustration, excepting in a way the old English farce and the strolling players. A reminiscence of this kind of ancient drama can even now be seen in many of the villages in the Madras Presidency away from the District and Taluq headquarters.

St. Appar was far in advance of his age even in his conception of the Drama as in the case of any other subject. Like any good ancient dramatist, he succeeds in rousing the imagination of the spectators, and supplying thereby all the illusions that can be created by screens and other mechanical contrivances of the stage. The said two chapters may be styled as 'Rāvaṇa at Mount Kailās'. If one should slowly read the stanzas word by word and in the end should try to recaptulate what were read, a kind of bioscopic movement of pictures, nay, something more than the bioscopic movement, a movement of solid speaking figures is presented in one's mental vision. A grand view of the Mount Kailās, the aereal car of Rāvaṇa, and his careless attempt to lift with his twenty hands the mountain itself which obstructed his passage succeed one after another. How he was made a jam in the attempt and how by his strong will, he made a veena with his bones and nerves and sang the hymns of Sāma Veda, and was therefore rewarded by Siva with an invisible sword are the other scenes in the action.

To appreciate this kind of crude drama we must, as was observed, become a rustic or a contemporary of St. Appar. If not, it will almost be impossible to understand the purpose of the peculiar dramatic recitation of the stanzas in the chapter "ஸ்ரீகைலாயம் திருநேரிசை". In spirit the whole chapter is a single *Keerthanam*. The special burden of the song "ஊன்றினான் மறித்துநோக்கில்லையன்றே" and the emphatic repetition of the phrase "கண்சிவந்து" (Rāvaṇa's reddening of eyes) and the alliteration of the hard letter 'க' were perhaps intended for the purpose of stirring up the drowsy crowd who surround the actors, and for exhibiting the heroism of Rāvaṇa by the high sounding words. The first and the last stanzas wherein there is a slight change in the artifice and a weakening of the lofty tone present in the other stanzas, give but a melodious beginning and a beautiful termination.

Even within the limited space of the said two chapters, there are elements which are worthy of any model drama.

We find in them all the three unities of Aristotle, the unity of place, time and action. There is also in them an excellent attempt to delineate the characters. In so doing, St. Appar does not say anything for or against any of the characters, but leaves us to draw our own inferences about them by understanding their nature from the action. We are pleased with the timidity of Pārvathi when Mount Kailās was lifted, for this is consistent with the innocent and lovely quality of a maiden Contrasted with that, we have Rāvaṇa the type of manly pride. He has superhuman strength but lacks in discretion. He has no forethought and so knows no hesitation. Therefore he is dogmatic and would not listen to good advice. Hence he wants to meddle with things of which he knews little and is thus brought to trouble.

Besides the epic and the dramatic elements we find some poems in St. Appar's Devāram which may be styled as the Didactic and the satiric. The chapter திருக்கன்றாப்பூர் திருத்தாண்டகம் is clearly a didactic piece of composition. Though St. Appar was ever too modest to give out precepts to the public, and wanted to confine therein to the description of Šiva bhaktas only, he unconsciously over-reached the bounds of descriptive poetry, and made a poetic sermon in the said chapter. Perhaps the town of Tirukanṛapoor was one of the strongholds of Saivam during the age of St. Appar. The inhabitants therein seem to have been model Saiva citizens whose daily programme is shown in stanzas 2, 4*; and it is very probable that our sage

---

* (ii) விடிவதுமே வெண்ணீற்றை மெய்யிற்பூசி
வெளுத்த மைந்த கீளொடு கோவணமுந்தற்றுச்
செடியுடைய வல்வினைநோய் தீர்ப்பாயென்றுஞ்
செல்கதிக்கு வழிகாட்டுஞ் சிவனே யென்றுஞ்
துடியனைய விடைமடவாள் பங்காவென்றுஞ்
சுடலைதனி னடமாடுஞ் சோதியென்றுங்
கடிமலர்தூய்த் தொழுமடியார் நெஞ்சினுள்ளே
கன்றாப்பூர் நடுத்தறியைக் காணலாமே.

(iii) எவரேனுந் தாயாக விலாடத்திட்ட
திருநீறு சாதன முங் கண்டாலுள்கி
யுவராதே யவரவரைக் கண்டபோது
உகந்தடிமை திறநினைந்தங்கு வந்துநோக்கி

enjoyed their company and hospitality for some period. Though we note occasionally certain preceptive character in some of his poems* which do or do not belong to any particular shrine, the treatment of his subject on the duties of Šaivites in this chapter is unparalleled by any other poem.† In it he presented to the readers and his disciples a perfect and a tolerably easy ideal which a Šaivite may pursue in worldly life in a practical and quite rational way.

யிவர்தேவ ரவர்தேவ ரென்று சொல்லி
  யிரண்டாட்டா தொழிந்தீசன் றிறமேபேணி
கவராதே தொழுமடியார் நெஞ்சினுள்ளே
  கன்றுப்பூர் நடுத்தறியைக் காணலாமே.

(iv) இலங்காலஞ்செல்லாநா ளென்று நெஞ்சத்
  திடையாதே யாவருக்கும் பிச்சையிட்டு
விலங்காதே நெறிநின்றங்கறிவேமிக்கு
  மெய்யன்பு புகப்பெய்து பொய்யை நீக்கித்
துலங்கா மெய் வானவரைக் காத்து நஞ்ச
  முண்ட பிராணடியிணைக்கே சித்தம் வைத்துக்
கலங்காதே தொழுமடியார் நெஞ்சினுள்ளே
  கன்றுப்பூர் நடுத்தறியைக் காணலாமே.

* cf. திருகோயிலில்லாத திருவிலூருந்
  திருவெண்ணீரணியாத திருவிலூரும்
பருக்கோடி பத்திமையாற் பாடாவூரும்
  பாங்கினொடு பலதளிகளில்லாவூரும்
விருப்பொடு வெண்சங்கமூதாவூரும்
  விதானமும் வெண்கொடியு மில்லாவூரும்
அருப்பொடு மலர்பறித்திட்டுண்ணாவூரு
  மவையெல்லாமூரல்லவடவிகாடே
தனித்திருத்தாண்டகம், Stanza, 5.

திருநாமமஞ்செழுத்து செப்பாராகிற்
  றீவண்ணர் திறமொருகாற் பேசாராகி
லொருகாலுந் திருக்கோயில் சூழாராகி
  லுண்பதன்முன் மலர்பறித்திட்டுண்ணாராகி
லருநோய்கள் கெடவெண்ணீரணியாராகி
  லளியற்றார் பிறந்தவாறேதோ வென்னிற்
பெருநோய்கள் மிகநலியப் பெயர்த்தும் செத்தும்
  பிறப்பதற்கே தொழிலாகி யிறக்கின்றாரே.
தனித்திருத்தாண்டகம், Stanza; 6.

† cf. The chapters "பலவகைத் திருத்தாண்டகம்",
'திருவொற்றியூர் திருநேரிசை', 'திருத்துருத்தி திருநேரிசை'
'திருச்சோற்றுத்துறை திருநேரிசை' பாவநாசத்திருக்குறுந்தொகை etc.

(To be continued.)

E. N. T.

The Plan of the Tamil Lexicon Committee.

In preparing this Lexicon we are dealing with all words used in the Tamil language, their spelling, derivation, various meanings, and uses as illustrated by quotations. Treatises, or extended explanations, belong to Encyclopædias, and are not included in the scope of a Lexicon. It is our purpose :—

(a) To scrutinise existing materials and utilise them ;

(b) Add words found in MSS. not formerly available ;

(c) Explain meanings from the classics hitherto overlooked ; and

(d) Introduce any new words that are in the living speech of the Tamil people.

In doing this we bespeak the friendly co-operation of all Tamil scholars and of organisations that have been established for the development of the Tamil language, and literature.

We specially invite the Tamil Sangams in Madura, Tanjore, Chidambaram, Madras and Jaffna, and the Saiva Sabah of Palamcottah to collect and forward to us accurate information in regard to their respective localities showing the Tamil terms used for :—

(i) Castes and sub-castes, with words expressing the peculiarities of each ;

(ii) Social customs and practices peculiar to each locality ;

(iii) Occupations, tools, utensils, etc. ;

(iv) Medical practices, herbs, etc. ;

(v) Religious ceremonies and beliefs ;

(vi) MSS. records and other materials useful for the preparation of a Lexicon.

We are also inviting a numder of specially qualified Tamil scholars to accept the position of Honorary Literary Associates, to whom we can refer from time to time for expert advice.

In this way we hope that all will have a share in continuing and commemorating the great work already done by Winslow, Rottler, Pope, K[illegible]ravelu Pillai anb other scholars.

J. S. Chandler,
Chairman.

THE UNIVERSITY AND INDIAN LANGUAGES.

I.

SANSKRIT VERSUS VERNACULARS.

The question of restoring the Indian languages to its old place in the University was fought over on the floor of the Senate House pretty warmly and, as a consequence of the unsatisfactory result arrived at, meetings are being held over different parts of the Presidency praying Government and the University for making the Vernaculars and other languages compulsory. The supporters of the Hon'ble Mr. T. V. Seshagiri Iyer's proposals had the best of the arguments, and the camp opposed to him was a heterogenous class consisting of social reformers, language reformers, red-tapists, faddists &c. &c., and their arguments sounded most hollow. In that camp were those who thought that oriental learning would lead to old ways of thinking and would retard social and political reform; there were those who thought that there was not much of value in the Vernaculars, and that Pundit learning and Pundit teaching, were no good; there were even those who thought that the reintroduction would disturb the time-table already established. There were those who thought that they should only, encourage the study of the Vernaculars for their own sake, but among the majority were those who really loved the Vernaculars. What struck us as remarkable, at the time we read the proceedings, was the fact that nearly all the Brahmins were ranged on one side and all the Europeans, and majority of non-Brahmins were ranged against them, including those whose attitude towards Vernaculars was well-known, and especially in the face of the strong evidence collected by the committee, that the study of the Indian language had declined hopelessly under the new curricula. We had our own suspicion on the matter which we expressed to our friends, knowing as we did the whole history of the introduction of the new curricula. But this is no more a secret, and the cat has been let out of the bag by a remarkable letter communicated to the *Madras Mail* by Rev. E. M.

Macphail of the Christian College and appearing in its issue of 14th March 1913, and which really explains the situation. In replying to the observations contained in the editorial appearing on 10th March, which by far was the ablest resume of the question, and strongly favoured the pro-Vernacular movement, the Rev. gentleman pointed out that there was no proposal before the Senate for the reintroduction of the compulsory study of the Vernaculars. The letter continues :—

The writer of your article has identified himself so completely with the minority that apparently he considers that all "Indian languages" are Vernaculars. During the last quarter of a century the study of Vernaculars was compulsory only for a short time, after the introduction of the new Regulation in the end of 1906. As soon as it was found that the compulsory Vernacular composition in the Intermediate Examinatiou was leading to the Vernaculars being studied in the schools, instead of Sanskrit, an agitation was commenced. It was proposad and finally carried in the Senate that the Vernacular composition test inserted by Government should be struck out. When Government refused to sanction this change it was proposed, as the next best thing to introduce translation from Sanskrit as an option to Vernacular composition. This was carried; vernacular ceased to be a compulsory subject and our new enthusiasts for the Vernaculars have yet shown no signs of proposing to go back upon their action. I do not mean, of course, to imply that these gentleman are oppossd to the Vernacular. Their attitude towards it is "I could not love thee, dear, so much, loved I not Sanskrit more" but the recollection of their action in the past deprives eloquent appeals for the study of the mother tongue of a good deal of their force. It is noteworthy, though your article does not mention it, that the large majority on Saturday included almost all the non-Brahmin Indian members of the Senate, and most of the men who have really done something for Vernacular literature.

Anybody who knew anything connected with the introduction of the new curricula in 1905, knew at the time that the Vernaculars were sought to be sacrificed in the interest of Sanskrit. But the dream of the Sanscritists was upset by the action of the Government who interfered at the last moment by imposing for the intermediate examination compulsory Vernacular composition as a result of the protests that were sent up by the Madura Tamil Sangam, Salem Tamil Sangam, Saiva Siddhanta Maha Samajam &c. The result of this was

that even those Brahmin students who were studying Sanskrit from the lower forms had to give up its study in favour of the Vernacular; and the further moves of the sanscritists are set forth in the letter quoted above. Mr. K. B. Ramanathan observed that he had to raise his solitary voice against going headlong in the matter, ever since the time these reforms were effectuated. We do not know if he was in the Senate at the time, but we received a long letter from the late lamented Dewan Bahadur V. Krishnamachariar, in which he bitterly complained how he stood alone in his advocacy of the claims of the Vernaculars.

This little historical perspective should be clearly perceived and the particular isssues placed before us fully understood, before any real solution of the difficulty can be reached, and the uncompromising attitude of the opposition as the *Madras Mail* calls it, can be removed.

From the resolutions passed at various meetings and reported in the papers the points at issue seem to be mixed up or are not clearly known. Most of the public bodies in the Tamil districts would seem to insist on the introduction of the compulsory study of the Vernaculars; but this was not the proposal before the Senate as is pointed out above. Under the old curriculam, even a non-Brahmin can take up Sanscrit or Latin or Arabic and the study of the Vernacular even in the lowest forms was not compulsory. The questions before us would then be "are we to go back to the old curricula as it stood before 1906", or "are we to introduce the compulsory study of the Vernaculars." We should like the public bodies and Sangams and Academies to have these questions before them clearly and pronounce in no unmistakable terms about them. We should like to ask the opposing sections in the Senate of our Alma Mater if they would unite, if the sole question before them was the introductiou of the compulsory study of the Vernaculars. We will go into the facts and the arguments advanced by both sides more fully in another paper.

II.

THE STRUGGLE OF THE VERNACULARS.

History repeats itself; and it will be pathetic to read of the hard struggle for existence which the vernaculars had to keep up during the past hundred years. In the early decades of the last century when the educational policy of the Government of India had to be settled, the fight was between English and the Vernaculars; and a fierce controversy ensued in which such eminent men as Macaulay, Hodgson and others took part, and there were many friends among the Europeans of that day who strongly advocated a vernacular education. The advocates of English however gained the day, though due provision was made for the study of the Vernaculars which was practically compulsory as in most of the High Schools and Colleges, there was no provision made for teaching Sanscrit. And the old U. C. S. examinations had two divisions one purely vernacular and the other anglo-vernacular; among those who had passed the purely vernacular U. C. S. examination, were some of the ablest men in the public service including Deputy Collectors, Sub-Judges, and even one District Judge. Then we had Col. G. Macdonald as director of public instruction who advocated the abolition of the Vernaculars, but the glamour in favour of Sanscrit had not arisen then at all, and the motion before the Senate was defeated. But the Director did the next best thing he could himself and the fate of the vernacular U. C. S. Examination was sealed. Sanscrit teaching was introduced in most Schools, and the Brahmin Students were making the best use of the facilities and the glamour in favour of it slowly rose, and the Senate became more and more Brahminised and they had for their spokesman another Director of Public Instruction, The Hon'ble Mr. G. H. Stuart; and he had evidently created a following among the Europeans also. The European Editor of the Madras *Educational Review* advocated the abolition of the Vernaculars but he was aware that the Senate as constituted then would not favour his Scheme, and waited for the day when the Senate would be reconstructed according to the new Scheme of the Universities' Commission, as there would then be a larger number of

aggressively inclined European Fellows; and we may say a larger number of the younger blood who became steeped in their veneration for Sanskrit. Then came the Commission itself, and as we learn there were none in it who knew anything about the merits of the South Indian Vernaculars except the Revered Dr. Miller, who did press on the Commission the importance of the Vernaculars. But his voice was a voice in the wilderness. This was strongly discussed in the papers, *Madras Mail*, *The Madras Times*, *The Hindu*, *The Siddhānta Dipika*, *The Educational Review*, &c. Rev. Mr. J. Lazarus, G. Padfield, Rev. J. A. Sharrock, Mr. A. Madaviah, Pandit S. M. Natesa Sastri, V. Srinivasa Sastri, (the Gentleman who now adorns the legislative council) and ourselves and others joined in the discussion. At the last meeting of the Senate, Mr. K. V. Rangasami Iyengar deprecated the introduction of racial questions in the consideration of languages, but the discussion in the papers even then took more or less a racial turn, especially when we noticed the warmth with which the Sanskritists treated the matter. The Commission decided against the vernaculars, being chiefly guided thereto by the conditions which prevailed in Northern India, and the violent clamour raised by the younger bloods among Madrasees. The Senate as constitued under the new act decided against the Vernaculars and when almost it was too late, the Government of Madras intervened and imposed Compulsory Vernacular Composition. Two other episodes we will mention and then close this paper. About 1897, on the initiative of Sir S. Subramania Iyer and Dr. D. Duncan, a proposal was put forward before the Senate for the introduction of an oriental side to the University. This was opposed mostly by Young Indians, and in 1910, the very gentlemen who opposed this proposal then, carried the establishment of an Examination for a Title in Oriental Learning before the Senate. During this vast period, one will be surprised to find how the same untruths or half-truths were repeated time after time by the opponents of the Vernaculars. And we shall go into some of these questions in our next.

J. M. N.

YATĪNDRA-MATA-DĪPIKĀ BY ŚRĪNIVĀSA.

Translated into English with notes by

Brahmaśrī A. Govindāchārya Svāmin, C.E., M.R.A.S., ETC.

We welcome this the latest production from the pen of Svāmi A. Govindāchārya. The author Śrīnivāsa is said to be the disciple of Doddārya or Mahāchārya, a friend and contemporary of the great Appaya Dīkshita, who is said to have lived between 1552-1624 and this gives an opportunity to our translator to introduce an apocryphal story about him tending to show the supremacy of the Vaishṇava faith. It would have been well if such stories are omitted in such standard treatises which are to go before a larger public than the small sect for which the book was originally intended. For there are also stories which are in currency which show how this bosom friend of the Dīkshata dealt by him and which we do not care to repeat here. We will request our friends not to relate such stories which savours of the miraculous in establishing the superiority of one religion over another. These are not the times when we will be guided by such stories but appeal should be made solely to human reasoning and the authority of admittedly old texts, in judging of the respective merits of these systems. We are sorry to note that the learned translator has more than once pointed out in foot-notes (also once in his Artha-pañchaka) that the Śaiva system is condemned in the Vedānta Sūtras under II. 2-35, by Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja and Madhava (see p. 81 & 116). This is certainly no reason against the soundness of the Śaiva system, as it will in no way go against the Pāñcharātra system if we point out that it is condemned by Śaṅkara, Nīlakaṇtha, Śrīkara, Mahomedans and Christians and Buddhists etc. But it shows an amount of obtuseness on the part of the writer when he forgets that the Sūtrakāra condemns the Pāñcharātra system in the very next Adhikarana number 9 (II, ii. 39 to 42). But there is this much of difference in the two arguments in the applicability thereof.

Whereas there is no difference of opinion as to what the latter adhikarana denotes, Rāmāṇuja and Śaṅkara would seem to think that 8th adhikarana is directed against the Nakulīśa or Lakutīśa Paśupata system, and not against Śaivism itself; and of course one has to learn that there are several systems which though recognizing Śiva as the Deity yet are considered as heterodox by strict Āgamānta Śaivism. And Śrīkaṇtha Śivāchārya himself says the argument is directed against Hiraṇyagarbhāgama theory. And in the foot-note also, our Āchāryasvāmi notes that Vallabha in his Aṇubhāshya accuses Śivāchāryas of Plagiarism from Rāmānuja. We dont see the reason for the repetition of this and he could have heaped up here everything and anything which the enemies of Śaivism had said; and as regards the statement of Appaya Dikshita in his Śivārkamaṇi Dīpikā, when the Svāmi was asked for the reference he was good enough to refer to Mr. Ḥālāsyanātha Śāstri's edition of which we were perfectly aware, and when he was asked for the particular reference, he has remained silent, and we presume that there is no such passage as he refers to in that work. And then, why does he refer to the question of Rāmānuja having borrowed from Srīkaṇtha at all? So far as we know no modern writer has done this, nor any ancient writer of any note. But it might be due to our writer's own awakened consciousness which could not but think when he reads Śrīkaṇtha's and Rāmānuja's Bhāshyams * together. We have gone into these little things at length, as though we have been ourselves anxious that the treasures of the Vaishṇava literature should be placed before the larger public and we had induced our Āchārya Svāmin himself to devote himself to the Tamil Literature, on

* What brazen impudence characterised the author of the Life of Rāmānuja in detailing the story of Goddess Sarasvatī herself, (The consoet of the dying God Four-faced Brahma) granting a certificate of merit for his commenting on *Kapyasa* will be evident when we note that the same interpretation was given of the text by Śrikaṇtha several centuries before. Vide Srikantha Bhāshya under I. i. 21.

the subject we notice a tendency on the part of Vaishṇava writers as in the *Brahmavādin* to rake up sectarian controversies. Our Svāmi's raking up of the *ṇatva Pratipātaham* controversy is also an instance of this sort. We remember reading a lot about this controversy in our youth in Tamil Journals and books and we then learnt that there was a learned treatise on the subject proving that the letter (*ṇ*) did not stand in the way of interpreting the word Nārāyaṇa as Śiva. But we have certainly outgrown these times, we care the least for the learning that would turn and twist words and sentences all out of their proper meaning and sense and to mean just even the opposite. We do not care in the least to know whether the word Nārāyaṇa denotes Śiva or not, but we are quite certain that the thing connoted by these two words are quite distinct as we will presently show, though in the respective Sahasranāma of these deities, the names of the one are applied to the other. Now as we go into the subject matter of the book we can promise the reader that it contains more than what we fancy Vaishṇavism to be.

The first part of the book (advent I to III comprising 61 pages out of a total of 175) is devoted to the discussion of the Pramāṇas (Pratyaksha, Anumāna and Śabda) or logical foundations of the system, and it will not interest the general reader and we however note that the Pāñcharātra Āgamas and Vaikanasa Āgamas are as authoritative as the Vedas, though all the Smritis, Itihāsas and Purāṇas are only of secondary importance. After the treatment of Pramāna, the Prameya is treated and this is divisible into the following.

Dravya or substance or A-dravya or non-substance.

The first into the following:

Item	No.	Class
Prakriti or Matter	1	Jaḍa.
Kāla or Time	2	Jaḍa.
Śuddha-satva or Pure matter	3	Ajaḍa.
Dharma-bhūta-Jñāna or Attributive consciousness	4	Ajaḍa.
Jiva or Soul	5	Ajaḍa.
and God	6	Ajaḍa.

The A-dravya is divided Satva, Rajas, Tamas, Sound, Touch, Colour, Savour, Odour, Samyōga (conjunction) and Force (Šakti).

And these are the different subjects treated of in the body of the work. In this, certain additions to the classification of Tatvatrayas would be at once perceived and Nos. 2 3 and 4 are quite new. Time though classed as Jada is not Prakriti (or Aprākrata) and this is an important Tatva,* which is usually omitted in the ordinary schools. But what are these Šuddha-tatva and Dharma-bhūta Jñāna. The last we never seem to have across in our Upanishats or Purāṇas or Itihāsas. It is translated as attributive consciousness and interpreted as conscious substance and as Ajada and self-luminous. In advent VII, it is further described as *non-sentient* which must mean *non-intelligent* or Jada and it is Vibhu and Dravya and Guṇa, though soul itself is Aṇu; and it is illuminant of objects, though non-sentient, and it is intellect or Intelligence (Buddhi), etc., and this is further said to be the eternal attribute of God and Soul. If the identification of it with Buddhi etc. is true, we then seem to spot it easily enough. It is the old old Buddhi, the product of Prakriti, and the distinction drawn between this *non-sentient* Ajada and the Jada-Prakriti is one without a difference, and the classification becomes certainly illogical. It is then pure Achit or Achaitanyam or Asat. "Like water issuing out of the hole a leather bag, consciousness streams through the one-ness of the senses, and contacts objects," And this is the *same* consciousness (Buddhi) which is eternal to both Jīva and to God, only in the case of the former it is obstructed, it does not flow out freely. But there is no difference at all in the substance of the intellect of God and the Soul. There are various terms synonymous with it, such as *Mati, Prajña, Samvit, Dhīshana, Dhih, Manīsha, Šemushi,, Medha, Buddhi.* It is this when affected by environment assumes the forms of Joy, grief, hate desire and will, and such things as: Perception, Inference, Word, Memory,

* See its place among the Vidya-tatvas in the Saiva cosmology.

Doubt, Conclusion, Difference, Fancy, Discernment, Endeavour, Temptation, Attachment, Hostility, Pride, Envy, Carving, Ostentation, Cupidity, Anger, Dignity, Stupor, Deceipt, Partiality, Sorrow etc., and Wisdom, Folly, Love, Contentment, Discontent, Greatness, Fatigue, Fame, Renunciation, Enjoyment, Friendship, Compassion, Aspiration of Release (*mumukshā*), Bashfulness, Patience, Discrimination, Wish to Conquer, Softness, Forgival, Wish to do, Disgust, Imagination, Hypocricy, Jealousy, Wish to kill, Cupidity, Vanity, Predilection, Prejudice, Dispute, (God-) Love (*bhakti*), Surrender (to God = *prapatti*), Lordship (or Power = Bhūti) etc., are but states of this Jñāna or Consciousness; as also the attributes of God himself such as: Knowledge, Power, Strength, Glory, Might and Light, Freedom, Love, Gentleness, Rectitude, Friendliness, Impartiality, Compassion, Sweetness, Dignity, Magnanimity, Tactfulness, Patience, Courage, Valour, Bravery etc.

We have noted the fact that this consciousness is the *same* in both God and man, and after the enumeration of the different varieties as above, the conclusion is certainly warranted that God is but man idealised, shorn of his upādhis and bad qualities, and all the good qualities, his power and knowledge, and will and love increased, and this is but a species of glorious anthropomorphism. That this is a conclusion we have not come to with a light heart will be evident as we proceed. In this chapter is discussed the different kinds Bhakti, and Karma and Yōga and the condemnation of Jñāna mārgas including Śaiva system is attempted. We will now proceed to enquire what this Śuddha Satva is. Our learned translator calls it pure matter and Prakriti is matter and he attempts a distinction between the two by calling them respectively subjective matter and objective matter. What he means by this is not self-evident? Can it be it means subtle-matter as opposed to gross matter. The author distinguishes it from the Triguṇātmaka Dravya (which our translator explains as meaning the Prakriti with the three guṇas) but how it is not evident, except that Avidyā is absent in the region of this Śuddha Satva and

it is this Šuddha Satva that constitutes the Heaven, Bliss (Ānanda) and objects, instruments, and places to both the Soul and God, such as fortune, etc. Perfumes, flowers, robes, compassions, ornaments, weapons, Terraces, Ramparts, Pavilions, Vimānams (air-cars), Parks and lotus decked ponds and the bodies of God and of the Nitya and Mukta souls. And it is heresy to declare (p. 94) that they have no such bodies formed of Šuddha Satva, that is to say that you cannot conceive of God or the Freed souls except as embodied in this Šuddha Satva or Pure matter and living and breathing in the region of Pure matter, and taking their pleasures (*Ānanda*) from this Pure matter. We find this Šuddha Satva though classed as Ajada described as *non-conscient* (p. 91) just as we found Dharma-bhūta Jñāna call non-sentient before. And after all it is *pure-matter*, and we cannot avoid the conviction that it is the same as the Satva of the three guṇas classed A-dravya, only it is not now mixed with the other two guṇas Tamas and Rajas but it is all the same, matter, Ašuddha māyā or mala or Pāša as Šaivites call it and the God and the Freed soul are clothed with it. And all these four are said to *Svayamprakāša* or self-luminous, this matter and its product Buddhi and this God and this soul without a distinction, and as was well-observed elsewhere, we have to seek for a new definition of Svayam prakāša.

But here there is not even the distinction between light and darkness, as the darkness (Pure Satva-Pure matter) is itself called light!

And do we not here see the real reason why the Pāñcharātris have a penchant for the word *Saguṇa* and why they call God Saguṇa, and all God's good qualities are compounded of this Pure matter. God is Saguṇa and Freed man is Saguṇa and where is the distinction between the two, except that one was already free, and one became freed, though both are lodged in the same region of Pure matter.

Now we go to the statements about Soul and God. Soul is self-luminous, It possesses *chetanatva*, which is to be the seat

of consciousness, *ātmatva* (translated as spiritness) which is to be the antithesis of matter, and Kartṛitva (agency) which is to be seat of consciousness of the form of Will (Saṅkalpa) and lo these are the very characteristics of God also without a shade of difference (p. 117). And the special characterists of the soul are Atomic *eum* cognoscitive, liegent *cum* cognoscitive, sustained, contingent, agent by delegation, which in its English (?) garb we confess we cannot make out at all. The souls are three-fold, *Baddha*, *Mukta* and *Nitya*, The Baddha include Brahma, Rudra to the worm, and Brahma sprang out of the navel-lotus of Śrīman Nārāyaṇa. We find the Divine Sītā included in this class of Bhadda souls, though she was Ayonija like Draupadi, Dṛishtadhyumna etc. The various sub-divisions of this class the curious can discover in these pages. Then the nature of the Mukta he can also read here, and the way they are conducted to the heavenly presence "A hundred damsels with garlands in hand etc., and is beautified by Brahma perfume etc., etc." The Nitya are such beings as Aṇanta, (God's couch) Garudha (God's vāhana) and Višvaksena and others. In this passage, (p. 134) we find the sentence: "Who is installed there with His (Queens) Šrī, Bhū, and Nīḷā" which we note for future reference. Advent IX deals with God (Īšvara). The characteristists of God are stated to be in what our Svāmi says is epigrammatic style, All-lordship, All-mastership, All-worshipfulness by work, All-fruit-givership, All-support, All-energising, All-word-indicated, All-knowledge-goal, All-bodiedness excepting His own body and consciousness. God is the efficient cause as He is the Willer; instrumental cause by Virtue of His immanence in Time etc. And here we expect how He is material cause but we meet the self-evident statement (p. 128) that material cause is that which results as EFFECT by undergoing modification! And Bhagavān Nārāyaṇa is all these. And in p. 146, we meet with this para which probably is an explanation "Brahman as constituted of the subtle, conscient (Chit) and the non-conscient (Achit) alone is the cause of the cosmos; and as constituted of the gross

conscient and non-conscient, alone is the Effect. Thus the creed of the Visishtādvaita Vedāntins is that no cause is different from its Effect." And in a foot note, we have this luminous explanation of the Translator.

"This is the law of Correlation. Every Effect has its own antecedent Cause to which it is correlated as gross to subtle. This is also the great doctrine of Evolution (*pariṇāma-vāda*) which Rāmānuja formulates and emphasizes. What is the evolute but its evolvent itself manifested in a different mode. No teak tree can be a product of a banyan seed. The Vedāntic evolution its triform, i.e. of the whole Complex Entity: the Visishta-Brahman, i.e. God-Soul-Matter, *vide* pp. 49 *ff* of my *Vade Mecum of Vedānta*.

That is to say God-soul-matter in a subtle condition is Cause; and God-soul-matter in gross condition is the Effect. We remember meeting with proposition in Doctor Bain's works that mind-body is the cause of mind-body. That is to say one is not derived from the other but one cannot be thought of and cannot exist independent of the other. If this is the sort of Pariṇāmavāda that the Light of Rāmānuja's School postulates we cannot cavil. But from the superior attitude assumed towards to pure Nimitta-karana-vādins, we were led to expect otherwise. God of the compound God-soul-matter is not the cause material of Soul-matter. If God of this God-soul-matter compound is either Bhagavān Śrīman Nārāyaṇa or not. If He is, then the Bhagavān Śrīman Nārāyaṇa is not the cause of Soul-matter, in which case, the refuter has to shake hands with the refuted. This involves the conclusion as we already suggested by our comparison of mind-body that the Blessed Bhagavān Srīman Nārāyaṇa cannot subsist apart from-soul-matter. And this is the right conclusion is evident from His living and breathing and enjoying solely in the regions of Pure matter.

Then we have to deal next with the five-fold aspect of God namely (1) Para, (2) Vyūha, (3) Vibhava, (4) Antaryāmi, and (5) Archa. We have descriptions of these and especially of Para or Parabrahma or Vāsudeva, with four hands seated

on a throne in Vaikuṇtha with all the attendants and ornaments and jewels, and *supported by Šrī, Bhū*, and *Nīḷā* etc. The Vyūha is divided into Vāsudeva, Saṅkarshaṇa, Pradyumna, and Aniruddha, and though their powers, ornaments, weapons etc., are given a proper attempt is not made to define them; and for this we have to look elsewhere. We refer to the learned Editorial in the September number of the Brahmavādin (1912). Supreme Brahman is Nārāyaṇa; He has four manifestations including Ārcha. Vāsudeva is possessed of six qualities as Knowledge, Power, Strength, Heroism, Sovereignty and Splendour. Power is the condition of becoming Material Cause of Universe, out of this Vāsudevā comes out the manifestation of Saṅkarshaṇa who has the Form of an individual Soul. Out of Him also come out Pradyumna of the form of the internal (Buddhi) organ of the mind, and Aniruddha or the principle of Egoity or self-assertion (Ahaṅkāra). This is according to Pāñcharātrāgama. According to the Vaikhānasa school, Supreme Brahman and individual Soul are one in reality, and Supreme Brahman is devoid of all characterising attributes, and attributes are ascribed to Him, only as steps to reach Him, and He is the Lord of Goddess Lakshmi (Srî), and Rudra and Brahma are chief of individual Souls and form part of Brahman Himself. And souls are mere distinctions in the Supreme Brahman and arise out of certain limiting conditions. The editor adds that the views of Vaikānasas are akin to those of certain non-dualists and therefore do not find much favour with Sri Vaishnavas. But what after all is the conclusion of the Pāñcharātris who declare matter and Buddhi and Ahaṅkāra as manifestations of God. The Tāntric School of the Saktas is essentially Māyāvāda or idealistic, and we cannot avoid the conclusion that the Pāñcharātra and Vaikhānasa Tantric Schools are also the same. The highest principle postulated by all these and other Hindu idealists is the One-Ātmā covered by Pure or Impure Matter and Avidyā which results in manifestation and Samsāra, and the One Ātmā, limited, bound is the Jîvātmā and there is no such separate thing as a Soul. The Idealists try to

get over the absurdity of the Supreme Brahman becoming bound, as an illusion and a myth, but the Vaishnavas admit the reality of the limiting condition and try to avoid the necessary conclusion by rising to a region of Pure Matter where Avidyā does not enter, though curiously enough this Avidyā is nothing else but Prakriti (matter) of which this Pure Matter is the essence.

Those who wish to appreciate the dialecties of this school had better go though pp. 141 to 144, in which all the texts which speak of Siva or Rudra as the Supreme Cause are whittled away. If, beyond all these texts, there is a text which relating to the Dahara Vidyā, speaks of Rudra as the Antaryāmi dwelling in Ākāša which Ākāša is identified with Nārāyaṇa, even here the indwelling Spirit, Šiva, simply means the auspicious graces or perfections inhering in Nārāyaṇa!

One more subject we will touch upon before we conclude this review. We have noted two passages where Srî, Bhū and Nîḷā are spoken of as the supporters of Nārāyana. Who these are, their origin, nature or characteristics are no where set forth. It does not appear whether these are identical or different On our Svāmi being referred to, he referred us to this and that and to his Arthapañchaka. Even in the last, the author does not discuss it at all and our Svāmi discusses it in a note (Appendix VIII). Šrî is *chāris* Grace, universal mediatrix, reconciler, peacemaker and mother. He points out further that there are not wanting those who equate or identify it with inert or inanimate (Jada) Prakriti or Nature; and observes that they forget that *Šrî-tatva* is sentient or intelligent (*Ajada*) and he says It is the Goddess of nature itself and all the Sāstras from Rig-Veda downwards bear it out, but he only quotes one passage from Skanda Purāna, which is *Anathema marantha* to all Vaishnavites. But there it is spoken of only as Para Prakriti and he identifies it with the Daiva-Prakriti of Gita. But what is the authority to explain what Para-Prakriti itself is and it is not subtle matter. Šaivas take it as such and not as the Supreme Intelligence or Ādišakti

or Jñānasakti of the Lord. Vide a table giving all its synonymns, meaning merely Māyā, at p. 68 of Śri Kāsivāsi Sentināthier's *Vaidika Śuddhādvaita Saiva Siddhānta Tatva* Table Catechism where he gives the authorities bearing on the subject also. And we find Professor M. Raṅgāchārya, M.A. of the Presidency College, Madras, ranging himself on the side of those who speak of Śri as Prakriti. (Vide *Brahmavādin*, Oct. Nov. 1912, p. 562). But even from all these references we fail to get any idea of who *Bhū* and *Nīḷā* are and we will be thankful to any one including our Svāmiji for throwing light on the subject. We are unable to trace the word Nīḷā in any of the existing Tamil or Sanskrit Dictionaries and she cannot be *Narpinnai* as this literally means the good after born, namely Lakshmi, as distinguished from her elder-sister *Jyeshṭha* or மூதேவி, born at the churning of the milky ocean. One thing more. After all the boast made about Rāmānuja having thrown open the door of religion to all people irrespective of Caste, we find the author of the Light of the School of Śri Rāmānuja denying even the path of Love (Bhakti) to Sūdras! See para at the head of p. 128.

No one would deny that there are elements of great beauty in the Vaishṇava system, but students of Comparative Religion cannot be satisfied with these alone; and every system must be judged as a whole on its sole merits in the bar of public reason. And we must confess this is the first time we had a glimpse of what Vaishnavism really was, and when we just take a peep behind its glorious veil, we find it hardly distinguishable from some of the schools of Indian idealism. However, there are very few workers, as our Âchārya Svāmin, who have done such Yeoman's service in bringing to the front this Light of Vaishnava Philosophy, and his disinterested and devoted labours are deserving of the eternal gratitude of the Indian Public. The book has been printed at our own Press and it will speak for itself.

"AGAMIC BUREAU NOTES."

The Tamil Lexicon Committee.

We are glad that the Chairman of the Tamil Lexicon Committee has come forward, in response to the general wish of the pubiic, and communicated to the Press the plan of the committee and he has entreated all public bodies and scholars to assist the committee with their help and suggestions; and we hope this call will be responded to heartily. Our readers will also be glad to know that Mr. J. M. Nallaswami Pillai has been invited by the Committee to become an Honorary Literary Associate and he has accepted the invitation.

***

Some queries.

We have received the following communication from Mr. S. Sivapādasundaram B.A. of Jaffna.

"In Dr. Peebles' article on Christmas" in the Junuary number of your journal you say 'To us He (Jesus) was a Yogi and Jivan-mukta.' I shall be very much obliged if you will kindly answer the following questions concerning it:—

(1) What are the attributes of a Jivan-mukta?

(2) Quote authorities (exact chapter and verse) to show that Jesus possessed all those attributes.

(3) What are your authorities as to the authenticity of the authorities you quote."

We do not wish to enter into any controversy with our friend, and the opinions we express are our own and we do not want to force it on any body, whether they are Saivites or Non-Saivites. We however give the following replies to the queries given above.

1. A Jivan-mukta is one, who, while retaining the body in this life, is full of God's love, and ever dwells in God, having lost all the three kinds of mala. Vide Sutra XII, Sivajñānabotham, and for more detailed explanation Verses 32, 33, Sivajñāna Siddhiyar, Sutra VIII and verse 35 speaks of them as having become God. That their acts should not be judged like those of mortals will be evident from the famous verse "பாதகங்கள்செய்திடினும் &c.," in Unmaineri vilakkam.

2 and 3. Verse 13, XV, St. John contains a statement of Jesus that he made his disciples his friends; and then he imparted them certain secret teaching which he did not do before. This Saha-marga

is the Sohām-marga or Yoga mārga. The several miracles he performed afford further proof Jesus being a Yogi.

His resurrection from the dead is the best proof of his being a Jivan-mukta. We are quite aware of all the controversies that have raged round the truth of the Gospels and especially of that of St. John, and as we said we do not want to enter into a controversy of the kind in our pages, and we do not want our friend to accept the truth of the Gospels, or of the incidents narrated therein, if he is not inclined to believe in them.

***

Anandasrama Sadhu-Maha Sangam. Fourth Anniversary.

This anniversary was celebrated a few doors off our office Premises from 20th to 23rd March. The meetings were from morn to dewy eve and late into the night, and there were practically double speakers on every subject, there being a separate chairman for each lecture, and the persons who proposed votes of thanks added something in their own turn. The subject comprised a vast variety of themes, but each was coloured by the particular cult of the Sangamites, namely, the Ekatmavāda, even such subjects as Bhakti, worship, Peace, &c. The speaker on Bhakti for instance divided it into Para Bhakti and Apara Bhakti, Parabhakti was Dhyana of Para-Brahman; and Apara Bhakti was itself of two kinds, the love of Kārana Brahman such as Siva, Nārayana &c., and another of a still lower kind, namely Bhakti devoted to Avatārs like Rāma, Krishna &c., and the speaker wore a Vaishnava Caste Mark. The speaker on '*Santam*' spoke vehemently on the evil of Desire and Hate and how they should be killed &c., and he laid down that like the monkey which holds to another branch before giving up one branch, man must hold on to something else if he must give up Kāma and Krodha and attain to Peace. The illustration was not correct as the monkey can jump from one branch to another, though the principle itself was correct and it is illustrated in our Siddhanta works by what we have called the Upanishad caterpillar. Though the speaker laid down the principle he did not proceed to lay down by holding to what, man can give up his Kāma and Krodha. Evidently he felt non-plussed by his Ekātmavāda principle which could not give room for another Principle other than man's soul. Of course they are entitled to hold their principles and we have no space here for entering into a discussion of their merits.

***

However, there was one subject which was handled by one Vadivelu Chettiyar who seems to be the leader among the Sangamites. He promised that he did not propose to treat the subject from a controversial point but would state simply the points of difference and similarity between the systems. He broke the rule however and our representative had to remind the chairman of the breach. He gave a brief statement of the Siddhanta position but enlarged largely on his own doctrine containing the pros and cons, but he however was good enough to desist after the reminder. According to him, the school which he represented was Vedanta, though all other Indian Schools and ancient books are agreed in calling it Ekātmavādā or Māyavāda, and he spoke of Siddhanta as the school of one section of Saivites. He said that the word Siddhānta meant no doubt accordng to grammarians and Logicians, a thing proved conclusively and the word was appropriated by a certain section of Saivites, which he evidently did not relish, though all the Agamas use the word as synonymous with Āgamānta, along with such words as *Samarasa* and *Sāra*. He said the Āgamas themselves, about 10 of them proclaimed his cult, and we would like to ask if he ever reads them and would like to call himself an Āgamāntin and Siddhāntin. And this is a peculiar feature which we noticed in this speaker and others. They freely quoted from Tiruvāchakam, Devāram (The Sangam by the way had Devāra Pārāyanam also) Tirumantram, and St. Tāyumānavar's Hymns, and we could not understand if they took these ancient works as their authorities, and if they considered themselves as the followers of these Saints, or they only quoted it in the ancient proverbial fashion to serve their own purpose. If they did not consider themselves as followers, then it was certainly objectionable and misleading; and as misleading as their wearing of Vibhuti and Rudraksha.

Difference and Similarity of Vedanta and Siddhanta.

***

Now to go into the points of contact and difference as set forth by him. He said that both schools accepted that the Tripadartha, Jagat Jiva Param or Pathi, Pasu, Pasa were *Anādi* or without beginning. And yet he said his cult stated that the *Anādi* was *Pravaha Anādi* (like the Buddhists) and this *Anādi* had an end. That this seeming resemblance is not of very great consequence will be evident from the fact that they do not admit the reality of the two out of the three. He said that both schools admitted the existence of māyā, and his school divided it into two, Āvaraṇa and Vikshepa, and Siddhantis divided it into 3 or five like māyā, Karma, Āṇava &c. That the speaker was abso-

lutely incorrect in the latter statement any student of Siddhānta knows. It is not māyā that is divided into 3 or 4, but the three or 5 are grouped under the generic term *mala* or Pāsa, (Impurity or bonds). He said the world, the phenomenal one was liable to destruction and its cause was not, and the First Cause was Parabrahman itself; according to his cult Parabrahman was not only Efficient but First or material Cause, and Siddhanta did not accept that God was the First Cause. He introduced the simile of spider and its web, and he evidently remembered the Siddhānti's Criticisms and he turned a somersault. It was not Akanda Brahman that was the efficient Cause; but the Karaṇa Brahma, who was a compound of Brahman and Māyā &c., Who was the cause of the world of Chetana and Achetana, which jugglery as we have seen has been performed by the Vaishnavas. Our speaker was willing to take into partnership our Vaishnavas, and yet he could not stomach them for God according to the speaker was only *Karpita* (illusory) Material Cause and not real Material Cause as according to the Vishishtadvaitis. And here he introduced a nice distinction. Brahman was *Sivam* (in the neuter) and the Karaṇa Brahman was Siva (in the masculine). He said that the Siddhantis laid claim to postulating 36 tattvas, but their own 28 tattvas compressed all the 36, and we should have like to know what these 28 tattvas were, and what their authorities and how they been comprised in the 36.

He quoted various verses from Siddhānta works to show that they held the world was false but we expected better than this, from him who proved as a great authority. Even a trio knows in what sense this is understood by Siddhantic. Going into the subject of means or Sādana he said there was absolutely no distinction between those postulated by his cult, namely, Sādana Chatushtaya, and those of Siddāntin's, namely, Chariya, Kriya, Yoga and Jñāna and yet he has to learn that no one can be even a chariyavan unless he had become perfected in the Sādana Chatustayam which is just a preliminary frame of mind fitting the aspirant to take up chariya &c. He then took up the subject of advaita and except by stating that the difference consisted in taking the negative prefix as meaning *Abhāva* or *Sādarsya*, he did not go into details.

He said that there was difference in the mukti postulated by both Schools, as in the one, there was no difference between Soul and God, and in the other there was difference, and there was Tiripudi knowledge. He was corrected in the last statement by our representative, and what seems to have led him to make this statement is the postulate that even in mukti there are three Padarthas. This is quite different from the statement that the soul is conscious of the difference of knower and known &c,

The absurdity of the position stated by the speaker would be easily perceived when as he himself stated that the Siddhāntins did postulate தற்போத இழவு, the destruction of Tatbodha or self-knowledge or consciousness, the feeling of I and mine. The soul has no cons-consciousness but its personality does subsist and it does feel the Bliss of the Lord. The gentleman who presided over the lecture was inclined to be more conciliatory than the lecturer and he observed that even in mukti there was not after all much difference, and that every religion, if it is true, must contain the five postulates of God, soul, matter, Bhanda and Moksha. Probably if they only practise what they profess, of their unbounded love and toleration of all doctrines, and study Siddhānta works with as much avidity as they do books of their own School, which in Tamil language are insignificant in number and more or less of a recent date, they would approach the Siddhantin's position much nearer and would be real Siddhantins themselves.

***

Sister Avabhamia.

On the evening of the last day, Sister Avabhamia delivered a lecture on Universal Brotherhood under the presidency of Dr. Nanjundu Row. She explained that this brotherhood involved Love, Unity and toleration and then she explained her mission to found a central college to train up male and female Sanyasins to carry our precious teachings to the homes of the poor and destitule. And we received that very morning her belated Magazine '*Vedanta Universal Messenger*' containing in one Volume all the numbers from May to Dec. 1912; and it is pathetic to read how all this delay was caused. The Volume contains Svami Vivekananda's famous Chicago lecture and various extracts from his works and letters and is exceedingly interesting. We hope to take up the number for a few more observations in our next.

***

Deva Samaj.

The name of this Samaj is a misnomer and according to our contemporary of the *Aryapatrika* it is an imposture or fraud. It is an atheistical creed with no *Deva* at all, and yet curiously it dabbles at spiritualism. The leader has also a curious name, Pandit Shivanarayana Agnihotri. We first heard of the movement and met its representative at the first convention of Religions at Calcutta, and was puzzled that it should be classed under the denomination of a religion; we however thought its ethical teachings innocuous and its educational work among the poor good. But instead of doing work quietly, it seems to be getting on the

warpath, and criticising, in not a commendable way, the belief in God, for a sample of which we refer the reader to the article appearing in the last issue of the *Mahabodhi* Journal, just to hand (Jan 1913), and which is to be continued also. The *Arya-Patrika* of 22nd March deals with the subject matter in its 'notes' very ably, and we cull these two short paragraphs.

***

Deva Samajists as Spiritualists.

"We have been led into making these remarks by reading a well-written article, in the local "Brahma-pracharak" of 10th current, on Deva Samajists of Lahore cracking jokes with theists. It is remarkable that these people, while teaching and preaching to the world that there is no God, are spiritualists in the bad sense of the word. Pandit Shivanarayan Agnihotri, the head of these people wrote the life of one of his wives, a Bengali lady who died some years ago, in which after describing her earthly career, there was given what pretended to be an account of the life after death of the deceased lady; how she met her boy who had preceded her and several other Deva Samajists. Although, it was stated in the book, others had gone further up in heavens, she, the poor soul, was detained in a lower region because she was a theist!"

***

Imposture.

"Such is the imposture of these Deva Samajists, and as if to add insult to injury, they call their propaganda "religion based on Science." Where is that Science which denies the existence of God and teaches spiritualism in its worse form? But every good thing in this world can be turned into an engine of deception when once in the hands of men who have intelligence but no conscience, and science is evidently no exception to the rule. The writer in the "Brahma Pracharak" retorts and says that if we theists cannot obtain information from our God about the person who threw the bomb at the Viceroy, why cannot Agnihotri summon his spirit to his help? The reward of a lakh of rupees will meet the requirements of his Jubilee Mahotsav Fund which he has started."

***

We extract the following Review from the *Vedanta Universal Messenger*;

Studies in Saiva Siddhanta.

"The above is an enthusiastic work on the study of the Saiva Siddhanta School of Hindu Philosophy, and gives valuable imformation of life in its variety in accordance with the beliefs of this school.

"We believe that all is one and the same religion, no matter what view each of us take of the external and internal phenomena of the universe. We have read part of this work and though we might see life from different view points at the same time, we find much of real help to ourself individually. If the word Veda--and Anta—means as we are informed, "the goal of all wisdom," then this school as well as every other on the face of the earth belong together, and there might be a difference in the letter, there is no difference in spirit.

"The book is carefully bound, and the text is both in the Tamil, and English, and written in such fluent and light way, and yet the power of each line is there in all its convincing and captivating way.

"Every unprejudiced mind will find help and light in this book even if other ideas upon the philosophy of life is paramount.

"We hope it will meet with the demand it deserves."

***

Tirumantram of St. Tirumular.*

We have to thank the editor for a copy of this valuable work, which is now brought out in a bulky Volume with footnotes, introduction and indexes &c. There is a rooted prejudice among orthodox Saivites to write any commentary on the Sacred *Tirumurai*, and the rule was first broken by a non-saivite by writing a commentary on the Famous Tiruvachaka Hymns and its was found paying. We do not commend this spirit, however well intentioned, when we know that even the most Sacred Vedas and Upanishads were commented on by Vidyaranya and Sankara respectively. Modern Times when Tamil Scholarship and study has fallen so low also require such help, if we do not wish such study to be given up altogether, all the religious lore and knowledge has been conserved to us in such books, and unless we are able to unlock its treasures, there will be absolutely no redemption for our people. And none of these works offer such difficulty as the one before us. One of the ablest Pandits who was helping the translator of this work gave up the task in utter despair. The book condenses all the teachings of the Agamanta, that its great importance to the study of Siddhanta cannot be easily estimated. And it is so important that even non-Siddantis quote it in season and out of season. We owe therefore a deep debt of graditude to the editor and publisher for bringing out the work with all necessary helps for its proper study. It contains

* Published by Mavai V. Visvanatha Pillai Avergal with an introduction by Dr. V. V. Ramanan, PH. D. &c., &c. Price Rs. 3-8-0. Madras Ripon Press.

foot-notes, and an index, and a valuable introduction by Doctor V. V.. Ramanan, in which he discusses the date of the author, sources of his life, wherefrom the system was derived, and the authorities thereof, the subject matter of the nine tantras &c. He discusses at some length the question whether all the verses contained in the collection were St. Tirumular's own or not, in as much as the number exceeds the traditional 3000, and which are specifically mentioned by the saint himself. The orthodox may look askance at such discussions, but still the discussion cannot but be of considerable value to students, and some of his criticisms are of great force besides. The publisher promises a fuller commentary to be brought out under the editorship of Dr. Ramanan and the book will be eagerly waited by the pnblic.

***

SAIVA SIDDHANTA MOVEMENT.

Two New Sabhas formed in Chittur (North Arcot).

We are glad to learn that two Saiva Sabhas have been established in Chittoor Town, and in its suburb of Santapet with the following objects.

1. To meet on every monday evening and recite the Sacred Hymns of the Tirumurai, and hear the Periapurana (Sivabhakta Vilasa) explained.

2. To conduct lessons in Saiva Siddhanta Sastras and Agamas.

3. To undertake pilgrimages to Siva shrines.

4. To establish a library.

Sriman V. D. Arunachala Mudaliar Avergal, B.A. (District Court Pleader) is the President of the Chittur Sabha, and Sriman T. Thiagaraja Mudaliar Avergal, Head Clerk Sub-court is the secretary, Tamil Pandit Rangasami Pillai is the Puranikar and Sriman Siddesa Mudaliar Avergal is the Devara Hymner. And ever since its establishment in October last, the meetings are being held regularly. Mr. C. T. Parthasaradhi Mudaliar Avergal B.A., L.T. Headmaster of the Board High School, who is conducting special lectures on the Skanda Mahapurana is rendering his valuable help to both the associations. On 24 March last, he delivered a most impressive and illuminative discourse on *The Tapas of Goddess Uma* at the Santapet Tirunavukkarasu Sabha and delighted the audience. We pray to our Lord Siva that He will speed their work.